

receipt of the first control signal followed by receipt of the second control signal within a second predetermined time period; and

unmuting the audible notification mechanism to allow operation upon receipt of the second control signal followed by receipt of the first control signal within a third predetermined time period.

90. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 88, wherein first and second control signals are implemented using a wireless technology selected from the group consisting of an ultrasound technology, an infrared technology, and a radio frequency technology.

91. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 90, wherein the restricted device further comprises a microphone coupled to the microcontroller, the microphone adapted to receive the first and second control signals implemented using the ultrasound technology.

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action of December 13, 2005, including the cited prior art. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 22, 32, and 37 to overcome the cited prior art. Finally, Applicant has corrected grammatical errors in claims 11 and 31, and amended the dependency of claim 24. In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks which follow, Applicant requests issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ariga (USPN 6,625,455) (“the ‘455 patent”). The ‘455 patent discloses a system for restricting the radio frequency transmissions of a cellular telephone within a defined restricted area. In addition, the ‘455 patent discloses a transmitter for

generating a control signal at an entrance to the restricted-communication area, and a cellular telephone that will turn itself off in response to the control signal. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the '455 patent does not disclose the use of an override mechanism within the cellular telephone responsive to a command sent over the radio-frequency carrier that can cause the cellular telephone to allow transmission of radio frequency transmissions within the restricted area. As amended, claim 1 requires the use of such an override mechanism. Applicant respectfully submits that as all elements of claim 1 are not disclosed by the '455 patent, claim 1 cannot be anticipated by the '455 patent. Further, as claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, if Examiner should find that claim 1 is allowable, claims 2 through 5 should be allowed as well.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 through 16, 22 through 26, and 32 through 41 also require an override mechanism, and should be allowed for the same reasons as claims 1 through 5.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the '455 patent. The '455 patent discloses a transmitter situated at the entrance of a restricted-communication area for generating a control signal which, when received by a compliant cell phone, will cause the cell phone to shut off. However, applicant respectfully submits that the '455 patent does not disclose a synchronization subsystem whereby at least one of a system of control transmitters is prevented from transmitting while another of the control transmitters is transmitting. As all elements of claim 11 are not disclosed by the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 cannot be obvious in light of the cited reference. As claims 12-16 are dependent on claim 11, if Examiner should find claim 11 allowable, claims 12-16 should be allowed as well.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27-31, 48-53, and 60-65 also require a synchronization system, and should be allowed for the same reason as claims 11-16. Note that claims 52, 53, 61, 62, 54, and 65 are listed as anticipated by the '455 patent as well. Applicant believes this is an error, as independent claims 48 and 60 are not listed as anticipated by the '455 patent. However, the same reasoning set forth above as regards the obviousness rejection of claim 11 would be applicable to an anticipation rejection as well.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by the '455 patent. The '455 patent discloses a system for restricting the radio frequency transmissions of a cellular telephone within a defined restricted area. In addition, the '455 patent discloses a transmitter for generating a control signal at an entrance to the restricted-communication area, and a cellular telephone that will turn itself off in response to the control signal. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the '455 patent does not disclose a receiver subsystem within the cellular phone that, in response to receipt of the control signal, generates an inhibit signal for a predetermined time after receipt of the control signal. As all elements of claim 17 are not disclosed by the 455 patent, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 cannot be anticipated by the '455 patent. Further, as claims 18-21 are dependent on claim 17, if Examiner finds claim 17 allowable, claims 18-21 should be allowed as well.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 42-47 also require generation within a cell phone of an inhibit signal for a predetermined time after receipt of the control signal, and should be allowed for the same reasons as claims 17-21.

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the '455 patent. The '455 patent discloses a system for restricting the radio frequency transmissions of a cellular telephone within a defined restricted area. In addition, the '455 patent discloses a transmitter for generating a control signal at an entrance to the restricted-communication area, and a cellular telephone that will turn itself off in response to the control signal. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the '455 patent does not disclose a cellular telephone wherein its *ringing* is inhibited on receipt of a control signal. Rather, the '455 patent discloses a cellular telephone that switches off the power of its radio section. Applicant respectfully submits that as all elements of claim 54 are disclosed by the '455 patent, the '455 patent cannot anticipate claim 54. Further, as claims 55-59 are dependent on claim 54, if Examiner should find claim 54 allowable, claims 55-59 should be allowed as well.

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the '455 patent. The '455 patent discloses a system for restricting the radio frequency transmissions of a cellular telephone within a defined restricted area. In addition, the '455 patent discloses a transmitter for generating a

control signal at an entrance to the restricted-communication area, and a cellular telephone that will turn itself off in response to the control signal. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the '455 patent does not disclose a restricted device including a microcontroller, where the microcontroller controls radio frequency transmissions of the restricted device based on the order of receipt of a first control signal and a second control signal. As all elements of claim 66 are not disclosed by the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 66 cannot be obvious in light of the cited reference. As claims 67-71 are dependent on claim 66, if Examiner should find claim 66 allowable, claims 67-71 should be allowed as well.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 72-77 and 83-91 also require a restrictive device responsive to the order of receipt of first and second control signals, and should be allowed for the same reasons as claims 67-71.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the amendments made to the claims and the argument set forth in this response, this application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued. However, should Examiner be of the opinion that further amendment or response is required; Applicant encourages Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below. Further, although no additional fees are believed to be due at this time, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo, Cummings & Mehler, Ltd., Deposit Account No. 50-1039 with reference to attorney docket number (254-0003.03).

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

By:

  
David Mundt, Reg. No. 41,207

July 11, 2006

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 419-0800  
Facsimile: (312) 419-0703